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## The trouble with kernels

- Kernel expansion

$$
f(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{i} k\left(x_{i}, x\right)
$$

- Number of basis functions increases linearly with sample size Inevitable unless you have essentially noise free cases (Steinwart \& Christmann)
- Approximate expansions are slow (d dimensions, n features, m samples)

|  | CPU Training | CPU Test | RAM Training | RAM Test |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Naive | $O\left(m^{2} d\right)$ | $O(m d)$ | $O(m d)$ | $O(m d)$ |
| Reduced set | $O\left(m^{2} d\right)$ | $O(n d)$ | $O(m d)$ | $O(n d)$ |
| Low rank | $O(m n d)$ | $O(n d)$ | $O(n d)$ | $O(n d)$ |
| Random Kitchen <br> Sinks | $O(m n d)$ | $O(n d)$ | $O(n d)$ | $O(n d)$ |
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## Random Kitchen Sinks (Rahimi \& Recht,

- RBF kernels have Fourier representation (Bochner, 1932)

$$
k\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)=\int d p(\omega) e^{i\langle\omega, x\rangle} e^{-i\left\langle\omega, x^{\prime}\right\rangle}
$$

- Draw frequencies from $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{w})$ and approximate kernel

$$
k\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{i\left\langle\omega_{j}, x\right\rangle} e^{-i\left\langle\omega_{j}, x^{\prime}\right\rangle} \text { where } \omega_{j} \sim p(\omega)
$$

- Special case - for Gaussian RBFs we ${ }^{j}$ draw terms from a Gaussian (Fourier transform of Gaussian)
- In general, draw w from spherically symmetric distribution (e.g. Gauss) and rescale
- Dominant cost
- Can we accelerate this? Does this work for other problems, too?
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## Key Idea

- Gaussian matrix M costs $O(n d)$ per multiplication
- Approximate by 'fake' Gaussian matrix (for moment assume that M is square)

$$
\tilde{M}=S H G \Pi H B
$$

-S is random diagonal scaling matrix (deals with spectrum)

- H is Hadamard matrix admitting $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{d} \log \mathrm{d})$ multiply

$$
H_{2 n}=\left[\begin{array}{cc}
H_{n} & H_{n} \\
H_{n} & -H_{n}
\end{array}\right] \text { and } H_{1}=1
$$

$-G$ is random diagonal Gaussian matrix
$-\Pi$ is random permutation matrix
$-B$ is random binary $\{-1,1\}$ diagonal matrix

- Multiplication is $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{d} \log \mathrm{d})$. Storage is $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{d})$. Draw independent blocks.
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## Properties of $\tilde{M}=S H G \Pi H B$

- Correct expectation
- Ignore $S$ - now each row is drawn from iid Gaussians
- Unfortunately all rows have same length, given bM $G \|_{\text {Frob }}^{2}$
- Use $S$ to randomize lengths (and adapt to different spectra)
- Covariance between features is well controlled

Theorem 4 (Low Variance) Let $v=x-x^{\prime}$ and denote by $\psi_{j}(v)=\cos \left(d^{-\frac{1}{2}}[H G \Pi H B v]_{j}\right)$ the $j$ th random feature for $j \in\{1 \ldots d\}$. Then for each $j$ we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{Var}\left[\psi_{j}(v)\right] & =\frac{1}{2}\left(1-e^{-\|v\|^{2}}\right)^{2}  \tag{16}\\
\operatorname{Var}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{d} \psi_{j}(v)\right] & \leq \frac{d}{2}\left(1-e^{-\|v\|^{2}}\right)^{2}+d C(\|v\|) \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

where $C(\alpha)=12 \alpha^{4}\left[e^{-\alpha^{2}}+\frac{\alpha^{2}}{3}\right]$.
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## Matrix approximation error
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## Generalization Performance (UCI CPU
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## Speed \& accuracy

| Dataset | $m$ | $d$ | Exact | Nystrom | Random <br> Kitchen Sinks | Fastfood <br> FFT | Fastfood |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Insurance Company (COIL2000) | 5,822 | 85 | 0.231 | 0.232 | 0.266 | 0.266 | 0.264 |
| Wine Quality | 4,080 | 11 | 0.819 | 0.797 | 0.740 | 0.721 | 0.740 |
| Parkinson Telemonitor | 4,700 | 21 | 0.059 | 0.058 | 0.054 | 0.052 | 0.054 |
| CPU | 6,554 | 21 | 7.271 | 6.758 | 7.103 | 4.544 | 7.366 |
| Relative location of CT slices (axial) | 42,800 | 384 | n.a. | 60.683 | 49.491 | 58.425 | 43.858 |
| KEGG Metabolic Reaction Network | 51,686 | 27 | n.a. | 17.872 | 17.837 | 17.826 | 17.818 |
| Year Prediction MSD | 463,715 | 90 | n.a. | 0.113 | 0.123 | 0.106 | 0.115 |
| Forest | 522,910 | 54 | n.a. | 0.837 | 0.840 | 0.838 | 0.840 |

## much faster

# works fine (no difference) 

| $d$ | $n$ | Fastfood | RKS | Speedup | RAM |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1,024 | 16,384 | 0.00058 s | 0.0139 s | 24 x | 256 x |
| 4,096 | 32,768 | 0.00136 s | 0.1224 s | 90 x | 1024 x |
| 8,192 | 65,536 | 0.00268 s | 0.5360 s | 200 x | 2048 x |
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## Summary

- Extensible to other kernels
- Easy to sample spectral distribution
- Easy to learn 'multiple kernels’ since dimensions are so cheap
- Extensible to localized basis functions
- Instantiate Neal's 1994 paper (GP and Neural Network equivalence)
- Matrix valued functions
- Iterate
- Stack several layers
- Backprop is very cheap since inverse Hadamard is O(d log d)
- $k\left(x, x^{\prime}\right)$ is now expensive (invariance theorem of difficulty ...)
- Covariance operators are not explicitly available
- Never store explicit feature map (too much memory required)

